SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

National Unanimity Recommended:

OR, THE

NECESSITY

OF A

CONSTITUTIONAL RESISTANCE.

National Unanimity Recommended:

OR, THE

NECESSITY

OF A

CONSTITUTIONAL RESISTANCE

TO THE

SINISTER DESIGNS

OF

False *BRETHREN,*

FOUNDED ON

The CONDUCT of ALL our *Miniſtries* ſince the *Acceſſion*; and particularly *That* of certain late profeſſing *Patriots.*

In Anſwer to

A Late *Miniſterial* Pamphlet, Intitled, *An* ENQUIRY *into the Preſent State of our Domeſtick Affairs. Shewing the Danger of a* NEW OPPOSITION, &c.

——*Latis Anguis in Herba.*

LONDON:
Printed for *J. Huggonſon* on *Ludgate Hill.* 1742.
[Price One Shilling.]

3,030380

AC911.742.N37

NATIONAL UNANIMITY RECOMMENDED.

SIR,

AS, in the Minority of *Louis* XIV. when the Cardinal Miniſter (*Mazarin*) was obliged to quit *France* for his *Miſconduct*, it was obſerved and ſaid, that his *Spirit* remained in the *Cabinet*, though his Perſon was withdrawn from the Court; we may ſay, with no leſs Truth, that the Spirit or *Genius* of our late moſt virtuous *Miniſter* preſides in all our *Councils*, tho' the *Man* be ſolacing himſelf at his Palace of *H——n*. We ſee the ſame *Maxims* obſerved, the ſame *Meaſures* purſued, ſince his laying down, which were exploded by the whole Nation, whilſt his Power had a viſible Exiſtence, and by none more than by *thoſe* whoſe *Vindication* you attempt in the * *Pamphlet* I am ſat down to conſider.

IF there were no other Proof of the Exiſtence of the late *Miniſter*'s Influence but this

* An *Enquiry* into the preſent State of our Domeſtick Affairs, &c.

very *Production* of your's, it would be ſufficient to convince the Incredulous; but, alas! every Step of the preſent *Miniſtry* carries with it a manifeſt Teſtimony, that they move as directed by an abdicated *Chief*. All his *Friends* are employed; all his *Tools* are encouraged; even his ſcribbling *Tools*, his *Gazetteer* Legion, are retained; and their Fuſtian Labours ſent *gratis*, as uſual, round the Kingdom.

After the Publication of a late *Report*, by which it appeared, that upwards of *Five thouſand Pounds* had been annually expended in the Circulation of *Miniſterial Falſhood*, the Public expected to ſee that *Article* at leaſt ſtruck out of the dark Account of *Secret Services* for the future. But when Men capitulate to be Sl——es for *Lucre*, there is no Abſurdity they won't; nay, there is none which they muſt not perpetrate to continue their ſubordinate Power. Implicit Obſequiouſneſs is the neceſſary Conſequence of a Precariouſneſs of Influence. If this had not been true in the preſent Caſe, would the late *Mock-Patriots*, now in Place, employ one of the late *Miniſters* ſtation'd *Gazetteer* Writers to vindicate their Conduct during the late Seſſions? Could they find none but the moſt *venal* Pen, and the moſt noted for *Venality* in the Nation, to juſtify the Inconſiſtency of the late *Actions* and former *Profeſſions?* The Anſwer is plain. The late Miniſter's *Tools* muſt be employed;

employed ; his Influence ſtill exiſts; and he muſt be obeyed. But if the new M——rs had not been under this *Neceſſity*, I don't ſee that they had the Alternative in their Power, it being certain, that none but one of the late Miniſter's *Scribes* was fit, or would undertake the Drudgery of vindicating a Set of Men, the moſt inconſiſtent and obnoxious that ever pretended to *Patrial* Love.

But, Sir, to be continued in your *quandum* Station of *Gazetteer*, and to become *Pamphlet Writer* to the *new Hands*, are not, if the Public be not miſinform'd, the only Employments we may congratulate you upon: Even old *Caleb* himſelf has been forced to give Way, being lately obliged to take to him a *Journeyman*, whom, a few Months ago, he would ſcorn to aſſociate with, or ſo much as reply to, but with a Sneer and Air of Superiority. Poor old *Counſellor!* how wretchedly art thou fallen, to be forced, after a ſucceſsful Conflict of *Sixteen Years*, to ſtoop to the Ignominy of palliating the late infamous Conduct of your old *Maſters*, and paying tacit Court to the late *Miniſter*, whom you had openly condemned and deſpiſed!

After the Death of poor *A——ſt*, ſome new Hand ſtepp'd in to *Caleb*'s Aid, who kept up, or rather exceeded in keeping up, the old Spirit of his Lucubrations ; but a very

ry few Weeks put a Period to the Satisfaction of the Publick. This accurate inſtructive Pen was changed for that, which now in the *Enquiry*, as well as in the *C—ſtſm—n*, for ſome little Time paſt, endeavours to draw off the Attention of an injured, deluded People from the Meaſures of their moſt dangerous *Enemies*.

Having thus, Sir, given you convincing Proof of my not being unacquainted with the Champion I am entered the Liſt with, it is time that we meaſure Weapons. Had I gratified my own Inclination, you would be ſtill unreplied to, ſuch was my Diſdain of all *Advocates* for the preſent Conduct of certain late *Opponents*; but the Importunity of a general Acquaintance has conquered my Abſtemiouſneſs, after waiting ſome time, in hopes that the Gentleman, whoſe Work you anſwer, would himſelf take up the Rod to give you gentle Correction.

I have been puzzled to aſſign a Reaſon why you omit mentioning the * Pamphlet you anſwer, at the ſame Time that you quote, almoſt in every Page, his very Expreſſions as the *Rumours* you attempt to anſwer. But my Bookſeller, who it ſeems had experienced your ſuperior Skill in the *Mechaniſm* of his Trade, ſoon ſolved my Doubts. ‘ Sir, ſaid ‘ he, when a Writer has a perſonal Grudge ‘ to

* The Conduct of the late and preſent M—ry compared, &c.

' to the Author of a *Pamphlet*, or would pre-
' vent the Run of it, for fear of the Impref-
' ſion it might make, he never will once
' mention the Work he anſwers, though it
' ingroſſes his whole Attention: Ah, Sir!
' added he, Mr. *C*—— knows too much of
' the Trade not to take all *Advantages*—You
' mean, ſaid I, of writing on that Side that
' *obliges* him moſt.'—Here let me put an End to a Dialogue, in Tenderneſs to your Character, which would enliven my Anſwer, did I give it entire. But I leave thoſe *mean* Advantages to the *mean* of Soul.

As true Sportſmen, in uncaſing the *wilely* Game, begin at his Poſteriors; ſo ſhall I begin with you, where you thought proper to end, by recommending *Unanimity amongſt ourſelves.* I readily own with you, this *publick Virtue* never to have been more neceſſary than at this Time; but not becauſe I think as you do (Page 53.) *That we have but very few political Wants at preſent*, but becauſe I can prove, that we never had ſo many, and ſo important *Wants*, as at this Inſtant. Whether or no we ſhall be relieved from them by an unanimous *Oppoſition* to thoſe who have brought our preſent *Hardſhips* upon us, I can't ſay; but ſure I am, that, without ſuch *Oppoſition*, there is not a moral Chance of our being as *Free* and Happy as the Conſtitution deſigned we ſhould be.

It is now near Half a Century ſince the Portraiture of our preſent *Falſe Brethren* has been drawn by an able *Whig* Pencil, who prophecy'd our Ruin at Hand whenever it ſhould pleaſe Providence, for our Sins, to curſe the Nation with ſuch a Set of *Guardians* as he deſcribed. The Quotation is long, but the Appoſiteneſs of it to the preſent Purpoſe, muſt excuſe me to the Reader. * 'The 'Tories, by taking Arms to defend their 'civil Rights, and by joining to depoſe *that* 'Prince, by whom thoſe Rights were viola-'ted, have, in the moſt public Manner, re-'nounced their Doctrine of *Jus divinum, paſ-'ſive Obedience* and *Non-Reſiſtance*.

'But if the *Whigs* ſhould hereafter take up 'their Stations; if they ſhould go upon that 'Ground, which the *Tories* have quitted; if 'they ſhould enter upon juſt ſuch Meaſures; 'if they ſhould purſue the ſame Councils; if 'they ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be imbibed 'with Notions imputed to *Tories*; our *Con-'ſtitution* muſt be intirely loſt.

'For they may *undermine* it without Suſ-'picion. Who will be jealous of *Thoſe* who 'have been preaching up *Liberty*, and accu-'ſing *Arbitrary Miniſters*, for Thirty (*Six-'teen*) Years? Who will ſuſpect ſuch *profeſs'd* 'Patriots?

* Doctor *D'Avenant*, in his Eſſay, &c. on the Ballance of Trade.

' *Patriots?* They may change the *Form of our*
' *Government*, and have the deluded People
' on their Side, who can have no Jealouſy of
' *them:* For the *Whigs* (Whiggiſh Princi-
' ples) are the Favourites of the People, as
' having ſo often preſerved *England*. No
' Perſon could be popular enough in *Rome* to
' think of ſubverting its *Conſtitution* in the
' Purity of the Commonwealth but *Manlius*,
' who had ſaved the Capitol.

' It will hardly be ſurmiſed that *they* can
' mean to enſlave us, who (by their *Actions*,
' *Speeches* and *Writings*, for many Years)
' ſeemed rather inclined to a *Republic* than a
' *deſpotic Government*. But if they ſhould
' come to change their *Minds*; if they ſhould
' throw off their *former Principles*, we ſhall
' be undone by the *very Men* whom we
' thought our ſureſt Friends.

' If *old Whigs* ſhould hunt after *Places* as
' much as ever the *Tories* did, or were *thought*
' *to do*; and if, like them, upon *Preferment*,
' they ſhould become quite *new Men in voting*,
' *thinking and ſpeaking*, *in a Moment making a*
' *ſudden Turn* from the whole Courſe of their
' former Lives; if *old Whigs* ſhould ever *take*
' *Bribes* and *Penſions* (or *Titles*) to betray
' their Truſt; if they ſhould do any thing to
' break the *Habeas Corpus* Act, which is the
' chief Guardian of our Liberties; or other-
' wiſe *add to the too great Power of the C—n*;

' if they ſhould *oppoſe* any good Act, *for the*
' *frequent* (*Electing or*) *Sitting of Parliaments*,
' which Wants, in the Conſtitution, produced
' all our former Miſeries; if they ſhould
' openly (or *ſecretly*) oppoſe any reaſonable
' Proviſion for Trials in Treaſon (*or the bring-*
' *ing great Delinquents to condign Puniſhments*);
' if they ſhould ſend their *Emiſſaries* about to
' *influence* or *corrupt Elections*; if *old Whigs*,
' to whom *Meum* and *Tuum* were once ſo ſa-
' cred, ſhould come to *load our Trade, and*
' *ruin our Traders, by unnatural Reſtraints*
' *and exorbitant Taxes*; if *old Whigs* ſhall
' perſuade any future Prince, as in ſome for-
' mer Reigns, to *cloſet Members* (or obtain
' his Conſent for ſo doing); if, by their
' Power, they ſhould get Men *turned out of*
' *Employment*, for purſuing the Dictates of
' their Conſcience and Underſtanding; if,
' like the *Miniſters* heretofore complained of,
' they ſhould have a *Band of Penſioners* rea-
' dy to give up *any Right*, to grant *any Sum*,
' and to *excuſe*, nay even vote their *Pay-*
' *Maſter* Thanks for any Male Adminiſtra-
' tion.

' If *old Whigs* ſhould reſtore to Men (Mi-
' niſter and his Tools) the ſame *diſhoneſt*
' *Intereſt* they had heretofore; if they ſhould
' *conſume* us in their *miniſterial*, and *ſell* us in
' their *legiſlative* Capacity; if they ſhould
' deſire to have Things govern'd rather by
' *Tricks* and *little Arts*, than according to

' the

' the Direction of the *Laws*, or the *Bent of*
' *the People*; if they, who, upon the virtu-
' ous Principle of keeping *England* a free
' Country, in former Times, oppoſed *all*
' *Exciſes*, ſhould be brought to create ſo
' many *new Offices* and *Officers* as may influ-
' ence *Elections* round the Kingdom; if they,
' who heretofore thought the beſt Way to
' preſerve their *civil Rights*, was to keep the
' *Purſe*, and to have always ſomething to
' give, ſhould be for ſettling *ſuch an immenſe*
' *Revenue on the Crown*, as may make Par-
' liaments unneceſſary or uſeleſs; if *they*, who
' were ſo careful in King *Charles*'s Reign,
' not to burthen the Nation with *Taxes*,
' ſhould give away the *People's Wealth*, as if
' *England* were a Mine of Treaſure, never to
' be exhauſted.

' If the *very Men*, &c. who heretofore
' thought *Armies* in Time of *Peace* and our
' *Freedoms* inconſiſtent; if the *ſame Men*
' ſhould throw off a *Whig Principle* ſo fun-
' damental; if *they* ſhould become the *open*
' *Advocates* for *ſtanding Forces* (for an *Army* of
' *Sixty* or *Seventy Thouſand Men.*)

' If in this Manner the *old Whigs*, &c.
' ſhould quite change their Minds, and go
' thus retrograde from all their *former*
' *Speeches*, *Actions* and *Counſels*; if they ſhould
' thus come to cloath themſelves in the foul,
' ridiculous and deteſted Garments of the *To-*

' *ries*, and give into the *worſt of their Mea-*
' *ſures*; and if all, that hath been here diſ-
' courſed, ſhould happen, *then would the Con-*
' *ſtitution of this Country be utterly ſubverted*'.

The diſcerning *Reader* will eaſily trace out the Features of the late and preſent M——rs in this Deſcription of *Whigs:* The Similitude is ſo very glaring, that he can't poſſibly overlook it. If then, he can have no Doubt upon him, as I am ſure he can't, if he will examine with the leaſt Circumſpection, that our late and preſent *Whigs* in Power exactly anſwer the Deſcription of thoſe whom, Dr. *D'Avenant* propheſies, *will utterly ſubvert our Conſtitution*, he cannot but think it his Duty to join in an *Oppoſition* to all their Meaſures of Danger and Ruin. In Juſtice to himſelf; in Juſtice to Poſterity; in Juſtice to his Country, each *Briton* is bound to countermine the *national Enemies*, be their *Profeſſions* never ſo ſpecious.

You perceive, Sir, with how different Views you and I recommend *Unanimity*. We both of us agree to its being neceſſary, but differ very widely in the Application. You recommend it by an *implicit Paſſiveneſs* to the Meaſures of a *Set of Men that have already deceived us*; but I injoin it as the only Remedy in our Power for defeating their *evil Deſigns*. Let the Publick judge between us; let them judge of the Honeſty, or even the Pro-

Propriety, of your *Title Page*, ſhewing *the Danger of a new Oppoſition.* If your miniſterial *Patrons* reſemble Dr. *D'Avenant's Wigs*, the Danger would be *in not oppoſing a new.* If they act not more conſiſtently with their *former Profeſſions* the next S—ns, than they did in the laſt, never was *an unanimous Oppoſition more neceſſary.* And yet you go on, in your *Title Page*, to *vindicate, modeſtly, ſome Characters which have been unjuſtly aſperſed.*

Let us admire your *Modeſty*, that attempts to vindicate Men whom the whole Nation deteſt for their *Diſſimulation—Characters unjuſtly aſperſed!* Good ſmooth Sir, is ſpeaking the *Truth* of Men aſperſing their Characters? It is ſaid of them, that they *oppoſed* more to get into *Power* and *Affluence* than to relieve their Country. Now if this can be proved upon them; if their *Actions*, ſince they are come into *Power*, prove their *Inſincerity* and *Ingratitude* to a Demonſtration, how are they *aſperſed* for being painted to the Life?—But of this we ſhall have Occaſion to ſay more as we proceed in our Examination of your *modeſt Vindication.*

It is obſervable, that all the *ſtation'd Scribes* affect the pompous Stile of their *Chief*, the Right R——d Author of the famous *Enquiry* in 1726. You not only ape him in his Manner and Diction, but borrow his very *Title* almoſt *verbatim.* All this might

might be forgiven; but to follow him in his *Falſehood* and *Abſurdities* is paſt bearing. As he ſet out with putting us in mind of our ſuperior Happineſs in that Reign; ſo do we find you (Page 1.) *admiring that Complaints ſhould not ceaſe, and that a general Satisfaction ſhould not ſpread itſelf among the People, who are, at preſent, as happy as the Circumſtances of* Europe *will allow,* &c. Pray, Sir, what mighty national Benefits have your *Patrons* conferred upon us that ſhould occaſion the *ſpreading a general Satisfaction?* Have they eaſed us of any of our *Taxes?* Have they repeal'd any of thoſe enſlaving *Laws* that endanger our *Freedom?* Have they puniſhed either the great *Delinquent* himſelf, or any of his impious *Tools?* Have they given any legal Encouragement to *Trade* or Induſtry, or taken any Steps to retrieve the *Woollen* Manufacture, or put a Stop to the Exportation of *Wool?* Have they leſſened the Number of a dangerous *ſtanding Army?* Have they obtained any one Thing in Favour of the People, for the *Millions* which they have granted the laſt S——ns? Have they, Sir, done any Thing for us, conferred any Benefit upon us, that ſhould ſilence our *Complaints*, much leſs increaſe our *Satisfaction?* As your great *Modeſty* won't permit you to anſwer in the *Affirmative*; and that your *Salary* may be endangered, ſhould you anſwer *Negatively*, we will ſpare you, and let the People anſwer for themſelves. What do they ſay? That your

your boasting *Patrons* deceived them in every Instance, and on every Occasion, since they had the *Power* to serve them as they *profess'd* they would, during their *Sixteen Years Opposition.*

But we are as happy, you say, *as the Circumstances of* Europe *will allow*, This is of a Piece with that standing *Excuse* for all our *Blunders* during the late Administration. The Treaty of *Utrecht* was ever lugg'd in to palliate all our destructive Measures. That flagitious Treaty hung upon us as a dead Weight, and must answer for all our Errors. The *Circumstances of* Europe stand us, at present, instead of that Pack-horse Treaty.

'Tis admitted, that the *Circumstances of* Europe *required* we should assist the Queen of *Hungary* with *Money*; perhaps it was necessary likewise that *Money* should be distributed to other Princes. But might not this have been done without being tyed up from doing any Thing in Favour of a People that gave *Millions* for these, and other less necessary Purposes? Supposing the *Circumstances of* Europe did not admit of a Reduction of our Debts or Taxes, was the Danger on the *Danube* so very great, as that the destructive Exportation of *Wool* could not be taken into Consideration and remedied? Would the Repeal of the *Septennial* Law have prevented the happy Progress of the *Austrian* or *Sardinian* Arms? Would the King

King of *Pruſſia* have broke off or poſtponed the Treaty of *Breſlau*, had our late *Patriots* ſent up proper *Place* and *Penſion* Bills; or an *Indemnification* Bill tacked to ſuch *Bills* as muſt neceſſarily have made their Way in the upper H—e? Would the *States General*, who are cool upon us for purſuing the ſame *Meaſures* they had diſliked in the late Adminiſtration, refuſe coming into an offenſive Alliance againſt *France* the more, had our *falſe Patriots* taken the genuine and proper Steps for puniſhing the late *Miniſter* and his Emiſſaries? Would the *French* and *Spaniſh* Fleets at *Toulon* have been the leſs intimidated by Mr. *Mathews*, if *Commiſſioners* had been appointed by Law for *ſtating and examining the publick Accounts of the Nation?* Would it have retarded the Siege of *Prague*, if the Bill for the *further Qualification of Juſtices of the Peace* had paſſed? Or, had it quickened the more Marſhal *Maillebois*'s March to relieve it, if the Bill *for regulating Veſtries had paſſed*, in Purſuance to the Petition of the Inhabitants of the City and Liberties of *Weſtminſter?* But this would have been paying too great a Regard to thoſe that had ſome time before petitioned againſt an *undue Election* for the ſaid City. Was it neceſſary to augment our Forces with 4000 Men from *Ireland*, in Favour of the Queen of *Hungary?* Might not the taking ſo many, or twice the Number, of *Foreigners* into our Pay anſwer her Purpoſe as well; and would it not have anſwer'd the

Purpoſes

Purpoſes and *Wiſhes* of a *free People* much better? Was there any Thing ſo very particular, ſo very critical in the *Circumſtances of* Europe, as that *nothing* could be done by our *Patriots* for the poor *Beaſts of Burthen* at home, whoſe *Purſe* they had opened more liberally than ever had been done by the late *Miniſter*, whom they pretended to have *oppoſed* for his *Profuſeneſs* of publick Money?

But, Sir, the *Purpoſe* of your *Patrons* being anſwered by the Removal of the late *Miniſter*, and the ſtepping into his *Places*; the Redreſs of *Grievances*, and the Security of their Conſtituents were of a too minute Conſideration to employ their Thoughts. After they had got into ſnug Neſts, their ſole View being to feather themſelves, they prudently thought of nothing but ſecuring the *Confidence* of *thoſe* whoſe Views *extended* far beyond the Bounds of this paltry *Iſland*.

If the Security of *lucrative Employments* had not been the *Ultimatum* of your *Patrons* Views, would they have parted with the *only Means* which could render the obtaining ſomething for their *Conſtituents* feazable? They knew, or might, from the Experience of all Ages, that the *Money* once granted, the People might whiſtle after Claims of Right. Therefore all the *Motions*, *Diviſions* and *Buſtles* made by your *Patrons* in Fa-

vour of the People, after the *Money* was given, was pure Farce; all their pretended Struggles after that, was with a View of flinging *Duſt* into the Eyes of a deluded unhappy People. All you ſay (Page 1.) of the *happy Coalition of the beſt Men of all Parties*, is abſurd and ridiculous, as there is neither Truth or Humour in the Phraſe. Good Men are incapable of *Inſincerity* and *Self-intereſt*; but your *Patrons*, by their whole Conduct after they had ſtarted into Power, ſhews, beyond a Contradiction, that they are tainted by theſe *Views*, *Ergo*, there is no *Coalition of the beſt Men of all Parties*; or if there be, there are moſt certainly no *good Men* in the Nation. But as we ought not, we cannot ſuggeſt any Thing ſo injurious to the Honour of a whole People, which ſuppoſe the *Coalition* you ſo much applaud, to be rather of the w——ſt than *beſt* of all *Parties*; and hope there will be a firm *Coalition* of the *latter*, in order to puniſh the *firſt*, and to redreſs the *Grievances* of an injured People.

'We are now, you ſay Page 3, within 'Sight of the Port, and it certainly behoves 'all honeſt and ſenſible Men to beſtir themſelves in ſuch a Manner, as may defeat the 'Deſigns of thoſe, who, becauſe they have 'not been able to ſeize the Helm of the 'Common Wealth, would again force us out 'to Sea.'——Your *Patrons*, indeed, your *Beſt Men of all Parties*, are ſnugly at Anchor in

in the only *Port* they ſteer'd to during their long *Oppoſition:* But they have left the ſilly good-natur'd *People*, who are ſtill toſſed in the Ocean of Uncertainty, to ſhift for themſelves. To theſe, your *beſt Men* promiſed Wonders, whilſt they aided them to ſail into *Poſts*; but the alluring Goal arrived at, the Gudgeons may ſink or ſwim. As your *Patrons* have played the Game, I admit it incumbent upon all *honeſt and ſenſible Men* to guard againſt the *Deſigns*, not of thoſe *who would and did not ſeize the Government of the Commonwealth*, but of *thoſe who have the Rudder in Hand.* We are able to judge of the *latter*; we feel the Weight of their *Fingers*; we ſweat under the *Burthen* they have continued, and added to, upon our Backs: But of the *former* we have no Experience that ſhould induce us to doubt their Integrity. Therefore, by all the Maxims of general Policy, we may not *unite* in Support of *thoſe that aggrieve us*, againſt Men that never have. It would be Madneſs for a Man to wink at the Stay of a T——f in his Houſe, becauſe the Purloiner's *Advocate* frightens him with the coming of a greater.

You go on, in the ſame Page 3, to tell us, 'That we may not, till Time has ſhewn the 'Juſtice or Injuſtice of their Purſuits, be able 'to judge whether ſuch as have had the Di'rection of our Affairs have deſerved the 'Truſt repoſed in them.' Sure, Sir, we may

be able to judge whether we are leſs *Burthen'd* or more *Free* now, than before your *Patrons* had *Truſt repoſed in them?* Does it require any great Degree of Conjuration for a People to know whether *coerſive Laws* be repealed, or whether their *Repreſentatives* had taken the proper and *only Means* for obtaining ſuch Securities for their *Liberties* as they have a Right to claim and expect? Is there any great Myſtery in judging whether Men's *Actions*, when they are in Power, come up to their *Profeſſions* when they were out? Is there a Doubt that *Seven Millions* have been granted without obtaining any one *Conceſſion* for the deluded *Diſburſers* of ſo enormous a Sum? Is it a Queſtion whether the *Great Delinquent* be basking in Safety in the Sun-ſhine of his *Plunder* and *Rapine*; or whether his *Protectors* be as *ſupple* and obſequious *Courtiers* as ever he was? If you can perſuade us out of all our *Senſes*, you may convince us that we ought not to judge of the Conduct of your *Patrons* till *Time has ſhewn the Juſtice or Injuſtice of their Purſuits.* But unleſs you can perſuade your Countrymen to ſwill luſtily of the Waters of *Lethe*, you will never be able to convince them, that they have not had already *Experience* enough to guide them in judging of the Juſtice or Injuſtice of your *Patron's* Purſuits.

In ſtating the Conduct of your virtuous *Patrons*, we find you profeſſing, Page 4, *to avoid*

avoid all Perſonal Reflection, being, thank God, at Enmity with no Man. It is no great Wonder that a Man, who writes to *Eat*, as *Colley* expreſſes it of himſelf, ſhould be at Enmity with no Party of Men. A *Swiſs* ſeldom troubles his Head about Enmity to thoſe he fights againſt, or Eſteem for thoſe he fights for: His ſole View is Bread. But ſuch, it ſeems, is the *Neutrality* which may be expected from your *Venality*, that we find your *Actions*, like your *Patrons*, contradicting your *Profeſſions*. You forgot that, in the foregoing Page, you adviſe *all honeſt and ſenſible Men to defeat the Deſigns of thoſe who, becauſe they have not been able to ſeize the Helm of the Commonwealth, would again force us out to Sea.* It is true here are no hard Names given to any one ſingle Gentleman that differs with your *Patrons*; but without doubt here is a general and ſevere *Reflection* on all thoſe whom they have left in the Lurch.——In like manner, you profeſs, in the ſame Page, avoiding all *Perſonal Panegyrick*, tho' you ſet out in your very firſt Page, with aſſerting, that your *Patrons* are the *beſt Men of all Parties*. Here again, is no one of your *Patrons* ſingled out for a Pattern of all Perfection; but is the Panegyrick leſs intended or fulſome for being general? But theſe are but *Peccadillos*; theſe *Florigelia* were neceſſary to engage the Attention, and captivate the Heart of the Reader. We will paſs them over, to come at Matter of greater Importance.

'We

'We have lately heard it aſſerted, you 'ſay Page 4, that tho' the Adminiſtration 'be changed, the Cauſes of Oppoſition re-'main.'——Truly, Sir, this is generally aſſerted, and, I think, upon the beſt Grounds that ever Aſſertion was founded. Your *Patrons* were ſupported by an injured People in oppoſing the late Miniſter, becauſe they thought, and were ſure, that his *Meaſures* tended to *Impoveriſh* and *Enſlave* them. If then theſe ſame People ſee the very ſame *Meaſures* purſued, which they ſo much dreaded and exploded, ſhew me any Reaſon why they ſhould not ſtill *oppoſe*, ſince the Cauſes of the late *Oppoſition* remain.—But how contradictory is it? You ſay, in the following Page, *to diſlike and oppoſe ſuch as but the other Day were eſteemed the beſt Patriots in the Kingdom?* — If your *late beſt Patriots* had lately *acted* as they had formerly *profeſſed*, the Contradiction had been palpable and ſhameful; but ſince they ſhamefully and ungratefully have ſacrificed their Honour and the genuine Intereſt of the People to lucrative Motives, the *Contradiction* retorts upon themſelves. There can be no Contradiction in diſliking and oppoſing *bad Men*; but to like and ſupport ſuch, would be an undoubted Contradiction, becauſe repugnant to the firſt Principles of Reaſon and Nature.

'We

'We ought, you ſay, to be grateful to 'them (your *Patrons*) for what is paſt. We 'are bound in Duty and Intereſt to ſupport 'them.' Pray, my refined Caſuiſt, what have your *Patrons* done for the People, ſince their ſliding into Places, that ſhould claim the People's Gratitude? Is it becauſe they have given away *Seven Millions* of Money, encreaſed a *Standing Army*, ſcreened the *Great Object* of their Hatred, and poſtponed, or put an abſolute *Negative* on every Motion for encouraging *Trade* or redreſſing Grievances? How does our *Duty* bind us to ſupport them? An *Engliſhman*'s firſt *Duty* is owing to his *Country*; if ſhe have received no Advantage by the late *Exchange of Hands*, without doubt your *Patrons* have no Claim of Right to this firſt and principal Duty. Therefore, before you exacted *Duty* from your Countrymen, you ſhould have ſhewn the *Motives* that obliged them to it.

But you will or may tell me, that your *Patrons* have obſequiouſly obeyed, and faithfully ſerved their R—l M—r; and therefore, as the People are taught, *upon our painted Bels*, to *honour* the K——, they are bound in *Duty* to ſupport his courtly *Courtiers*. I have nothing to object to the laudable Cuſtom of our Fore-Fathers of ornamenting their Sign-Poſts with elegant and expreſſive Motto's; but I fancy you will find it a difficult Matter to perſuade

ſuade the preſent Generation, that any *Duty* is owing to *Courtiers*, unleſs they ſerve the People as well as the K——.——Ay, but it is the People's *Intereſt*, you ſay, to ſupport your *Employers*—The Reaſon is curious, 'As it would be ſetting a bad Precedent to 'ſucceeding Times, in which few will ven-'ture to ſerve their *Country* rather than *them-'ſelves*, if they are ſure to ſee their *Diſinter-'eſtedneſs* repaid by exceſſive Abuſe.——I wonder a Writer that had dabbled ſo often on *both Sides*, could not ſee the Inaptneſs of this ſmooth Period.——How gifted are your *Patrons!* How clean and hallowed their *Hands*, for having ſerved their *Country* rather than *themſelves!* As this Inſtance of their exalted *Diſintereſtedneſs* may eſcape the Notice of the inaccurate Hiſtorians of our Times, be it known to all Poſterity, *That our late Patriots, in accepting Places, Penſions and Titles; in granting all that the C——n could wiſh for; and in not anſwering, in any one ſingle Inſtance, the Wiſhes or Hopes of the People, have, notwithſtanding, ſerved their* Country *rather than* themſelves.

Now, Sir, as *to ſetting bad Precedents*, I hold it far more dangerous to lick the Heels of *bad Men*, than to oppoſe and upbraid them. How came the late *Miniſter* to dare treat the Nation as he did; but becauſe he ſaw that the People not only had borne but ſupported his *Predeceſſors*, that were little better

better than himſelf? How comes it that your *Patrons* dare break their Words with the ſame infatuated People; but becauſe, tho' the late *Miniſter* made them the ſame *Profeſſions* whilſt he was *oppoſing* the Court, and broke his *Promiſe* as ſoon as he got into a *Place*, yet was he upheld and ſupported? But how dare they venture to exaſperate a whole People, by purſuing *Meaſures*, which they diſliked in the late *Miniſter?* Becauſe they expect to come off with the *publick Spoil* as he has, by ſham C——s, Rep——ts and the Shelter of the Th——ne, ſhould ever a virtuous, unanimous *Oppoſition* force them from their ſtrong Holds.——*Bad Precedents*, in Truth, are very dangerous Things. We have had too many of them for a *Half*, or, if you will, a *whole* Century. It is time the People ſhould think of ſetting ſome *good ones*; and, as good Things can never come too ſoon, I hope they will begin to *oppoſe*, with the utmoſt *Unanimity*, all obſequious, ſlaviſh C——rs, and *falſe Brethren*.

'How could your *Patrons*, you ſay Page '8, continue to *act* as they had *profeſſed*, 'whilſt they oppoſed the late *Miniſter* in 'Conjunction with the *Tories*, who have 'conſtantly thought all *Miniſtries* in the 'Wrong ſince the *Acceſſion* of the preſent 'Royal Family?——This was directly what I expected from the venal Advocate of a more venal M——ry. The *Circumſtances of Europe*

in one Hand, and the *Tories* in the other; how unequal the Conflict with a feeble Man as I am, who has nothing but poor *Truth* and *Experience*, either to aſſail or defend withal!

Before we go farther, Sir, be ſo kind as to inform me, why could not your Patrons have acted, ſince their coming into Places, upon the true Principles of *Whiggiſm*, which they *profeſſed* whilſt they were *oppoſing*. On the contrary, we have Proof that thoſe malignant *Tories*, together with many worthy *Whigs*, have acted, not only like Men of Honour, by keeping up to their Profeſſions, but upon ſuch *Principles* as old *Hampden* himſelf would not be aſhamed of. They were not againſt the *Supplies*, but they would have it remembered, that their *Conſtituents* had a Right to a Redreſs of *Grievances*, whilſt they were giving *Millions*: Nor were they againſt an *Army*, and a great one too; nay, the Army might be doubled, if thought neceſſary; but then they wiſhed that the Augmentation might be rather of *Foreigners* than *Natives*, as more conſiſtent with the *Freedom* of their Country. In ſhort, theſe unhappy *Tories*, and the *Tory-Whigs*, who joined them after the Separation of your conſiſtent *Patrons*, were for every Meaſure that tended to the Safety of the Crown, and the Security of the Ballance of Power; but indeed they were not quite ſo willing to do every

every thing for our Allies, for a *foreign Concern*, for the late *Miniſter*, and for the C—n, when nothing could be obtained for their *Conſtituents*.

But the heavieſt Charge againſt the *Tories* is yet to come. *They have conſtantly thought all Miniſters wrong ſince the Acceſſion.*——This is the Man who would ſcrupulouſly avoid all *Reflection*. But to our Purpoſe; If all our *Miniſtries* ſince the Acceſſion have taken wrong Meaſures, how are the *Tories* to blame for having thought them in the Wrong? You ſhould firſt have ſhewn the Rectitude of the Conduct of our late *Miniſtries*, before you threw out this unguarded Charge againſt a large Body of Men, who, for any Thing that can be objected to them ſince the *Acceſſion*, appear no leſs the Friends of the Royal Family than your *Patrons*; and it is no leſs evident that they have been no leſs the true Friends of their Country.—But let us caſt an Eye back upon our *Miniſtries* ſince the Acceſſion.

In the firſt *Miniſtry* of GEORGE I. our late virtuous *Miniſter* was employed as firſt Commiſſioner of the *Treaſury*, till the Year 1717, when the late Earl of *St——pe*, who uſed Means for turning him out, ſaid of him publickly, *That he would ruin any Country, and was a Diſgrace to any Miniſtry.* If this don't convince you, that the *Tories* were in the

Right to think that *Miniſtry* in the *Wrong*, I will bring you the War with *Sweden*, the Purchaſe of *B——n* and *V——n*, foreign Subſidies, *Heſſian* Troops, the *Quadruple* Alliance, the diſpoſſeſſing the Duke of *Savoy* of *Sicily*, the *Septennial* Act, the *Riot* Act, a *ſtanding Army*, and a long Catalogue of many more precious Items.

To the ſubſequent *Miniſtry* we owe the preſent War with *Spain*, as well as all our other expenſive Quarrels and Brangles with that uſeful People, by what they call treacherouſly falling upon their Fleet in 1718. To the ſame upright *Miniſtry* we owe all the Calamities which attended the *South-Sea* Scheme. In their Time was the famous Promiſe made to reſtore *Gibralter*. They are chargeable with the Non-acceptance of the ſole *Mediation* at *Cambray*, which threw *Spain* into the late Emperor's Arms, and *B——n* into the friendly Arms of *France*. *Taxes*, *Standing Armies*, *Secret Service*, new Grants to the *Civil Liſt*, coercive *Laws*, *&c. &c.* went forward as in the foregoing *Miniſtry*. I flatter myſelf you will forgive the *Tories* for not thinking this *Miniſtry* no honeſter or more upright than their Predeceſſors.

We are at laſt come down to the moſt worthy late *Miniſter*, who, for upwards of Twenty Years, was Miniſtry, Council, P—t, K—— and every Thing, but a *P—l—y*, *S—d—s*

S—d—s and *C——t——t*, who oppoſed him, that they might be what he was. They have ſucceeded for our Sins; becauſe they have all his *Vices*, but none of his *Virtues*.

Sure I need not ſhew, that the *Tories* were *right* in thinking the late Miniſtry *wrong*, ſince your own *Patron's* long *Oppoſition* proves it but too evidently. If then no *Honeſty*, no Patriotiſm, no Rectitude can be traced in the Conduct of any of our *Miniſters* ſince the *Acceſſion*, with what Injuſtice, with what Arrogance do you ſuggeſt their (the *Tories*) *Diſaffection* to the preſent *Royal Family*, for oppoſing *Miniſtries*, whom they ſaw in the Wrong; and whom, all the Nation at this Time are convinced, from dire Experience, to have been in the Wrong?

But tho' it be evident to Demonſtration, that the *Tories* had oppoſed the *Miniſtries* ſince the *Acceſſion*, not becauſe they were diſaffected, but becauſe all *Miniſtries*, ſince the *Acceſſion*, took *wrong* Steps; you will not allow your *Patrons* to draw with them. We muſt ſay, that for an Author who has been a general *Medler*, you keep your *Maſters* to too hard Meat. What! not allow them to keep Men Company whilſt they act *uprightly*, becauſe they had *hard Names* given them Fifty Years ago by their Enemies! —'How 'could *Whigs*, &c. (you ſay Page 9.) go on 'with

' with theſe Men (*Tories*) to the End, with-
' out embracing their Notions, and forſaking
' their own?'—How, indeed! It would be an unparalled Hardſhip to oblige Men to *forſake* their own ſelf-ſatiating *Notions*, which went no further than getting into *Places*, in order to *embrace* the romantick *Notions* of their *Confederates*, whoſe Views extended as far as the general Welfare of the Nation.—— You go on, in the ſame Page ' Or upon what ' juſtifiable Grounds they could have done ' this, I ſhould be glad if one of theſe *great* ' *Wits* would ſhew us.'

You have left us here quite in the Dark, as to the Qualifications or Principles of the *great Wits* you thus throw out the Gauntlet to; but as you had dreamed of the *Tories* juſt before, 'tis not unlikely but you may have meant the *great Wits* of that Party. As I have been a *Whig* from my Cradle, but of quite another Species than your Patrons, and have a tolerable good *Memory*; which, if there be any Truth in the old Saying, is no Characteriſtick of a *great Wit*, I can by no Means flatter myſelf to come within your Deſcription: I ſhan't, therefore, attempt the Solution of ſo knotty a Point, either as a *Tory* or *great Wit*; but if you will admit of the humble Interpretation of a Brother *ſmall Wit*, and a *Whig* too, here it is at your Service.

You

You ask, *upon what juſtifiable Grounds could your Patrons continue to act with the Tories?* Here you give the Name of *Tories* to all who have not concurred with your *Patrons* ſince they accepted of *Places*. With all my Heart, call us by that Name if you pleaſe; call us by any Name, ſo that we are *diſtinguiſh'd* from *ſelf-intereſted, ſlaviſh Falſe-Brethren.*— Now, in my humble Opinion, the Point which ſeems to puzzle your wiſe Head ſo much, may be cleared up in almoſt as few Words as you employ'd to ſtate the Difficulty —The bad Conduct of the late *Miniſtry* juſtified an *Oppoſition*; but the *Oppoſition*, on the *Tory* Side, was not to the *Miniſters*, but their *Meaſures*: Therefore, as the ſame *Meaſures* continued after the Reſignation of the late *Miniſter*, the *Tories* are not only juſtified for having continued the *Oppoſition*, but your *Patrons* would have been *juſtified* for concurring with them. Here, Sir, is a plain, but juſt Anſwer to the mighty *Queſtion* you put with ſuch an Air of Importance. It is ſo convincing, that I defy all the *great Wits*, in the preſent M——ry, to refute it, unleſs they can ſhew that the ſame *Meaſures* are not purſued for which the late *Miniſter* was oppoſed. A Change in the Circumſtances of Affairs abroad, required ſome ſeeming Variation in our Conduct at home, ſince the laying down of the late *Miniſter*; but this is

no

no more than would, and muſt have been, had he ſtill ruled in Perſon. All the *Actions* of your *Prtrons*, ſince they have been in Power, particularly during the the late S—ns, proves as evidently the Exiſtence of the ſame *Meaſures*, as that their long *Oppoſition* was to the late *Miniſter*, and not to his Meaſures.

But tho' this Truth be as clear as the Sun, we find you, Page 12, aſſerting the direct contrary; that is, if the Declaration of ſome Men may be believed. 'Many of the Gen-'tlemen who have lately taken *Places*, de-'clared frequently, that they oppoſed *Mea-'ſures* and not *Men*.'——They did ſo; and they would be Numſculs if they did not. Was ever R———e ſo weak, as to declare his r———ſh Deſigns? The People's Quarrel to your *Place-Men* is not about their former Declarations or *Profeſſions*, but their *Actions*. But theſe you attempt to juſtify in the next Page 13, by asking a few modeſt Queſtions. *In what have they done amiſs? How have they deſerved their Principles? What Grounds have they given for bringing any Charge againſt them?*

I have known ſome honeſt Fellows thrive by paying certain *worldly Men* in the ſame *Coin* which they had impoſed upon them. Now what, if inſtead of a direct Anſwer to your Interrogatories, I ſhould put you as many? In what have your Patrons done as

the

the whole Nation expected? How have they acted up to their *Principles*, ſuppoſing their Principles to be what they profeſs'd, truly honeſt and *whiggiſh?* What Grounds have they giving for acquitting them of every Charge brought againſt them? As our Queries differ widely, it is not likely we ſhall agree; therefore, let the *People*, the proper Judges, decide between us. You promiſe, Page 14, *to ſubmit all you have ſaid to a fair Enquiry.* I agree to your Propoſal with all my Heart. *A fair Enquiry* into the Actions of your *Patrons*, will, I am ſure, prove as full a Juſtification as Man could wiſh, of what the whole People complain of, their *Perfidy, Avarice and Ambition.*

After ſpending fourteen long, I won't ſay dull, Pages in your *Exordium*, or ſome nameleſs tedious Something, you come to Facts, or what you call *Particulars*, with which you promiſe to ſcrub your *Patrons* till the Publick allow them to be as clean on the *Breaſt*, and the *Palms* of their Hands, as the late *Miniſter* and his Tools. The *Weſtminſter* Election is the firſt of your cleanſing *Particulars*; and, therein, you ſay, (Page 15.) *Your Patrons acted, as they acted in all Things.* —So they did, in Truth, with a View to *Places* end Power. 'Tis true, you ſay, *with Decency and Circumſpection.* The Word *Circumſpection* has an obvious Meaning, where

Men have *Preferment* in View ; but I am not ſo very clear with Regard to the Word *Decency*. The Word is often uſed where the *Throne* is concerned ; but as it cannot be ſuppoſed that any *very great Man* would interfere, much leſs countenance or *gratify* in Matters of Elections, the Word, in this Place, muſt have ſome very extraordinary, or no Meaning at all : Wherefore we will leave the finding it to ſome of the m——l *great Wits* —Well ! leaving the Word *Decency* to anſwer for itſelf, you go on ; ' They ' (your Patrons) manifeſted a juſt Zeal for ' Freedom in Elections, for the Cenſure of ' undue Influence, and for the inflicting ſuch ' Puniſhments as were proper to render it a ' fit Precedent for ſucceeding Times.'

I confeſs to have been weak enough to think, that your great Experience in the Art of *varniſhing* would have prevented you from committing ſo egregious a Blunder, as attempting to defend Men where they are weakeſt of Defence.—The *Weſtminſter* Election ! God help you ! there is not a Child in that City and the next to it, but curſe your *Patrons* for not ſending the Army-commanding *Juſtices*, and the Courtly-returning *Officer*, to the D——l. *Newgate* was too good a Place for ſuch corrupted *Miſcreants* : But why were they not ſent even there, and kept there to the End of the Seſſions? Why was

there

there no *Addreſs* for diſcharging the *Juſtices* from their Office? Why, in ſhort, was nothing done to make a *Precedent for ſucceeding* Times? Becauſe *Decency*, in Regard to *Somebody*, and *Circumſpection*, in Regard to *Preferment*, would not permit venal Men to do their Duty.

From Page 15 to 27, you are pleaſed to oblige us with ſome of the fineſt Strokes of your Art to juſtify the Conduct of your *Patrons*, with Regard to the Adjournment of the *Committee of Elections*, and their *Moderation* in proſecuting the late *Miniſter*. The Whole of your Vindication, however, after many learned Doublings and Windings, amounts to no more than this: That if the *new Miniſters* had acted up to their *Profeſſions* whilſt they were oppoſing the late Miniſter, *the Cardinal* (Page 22.) *might then again reſume his Schemes, foment freſh Quarrels here, and*, &c. &c.——A Writer, with a fertile Brain, is never at a Pinch any more than a Mountebank, who has his Pills, Powders, Drops and Plaiſters to cure all Diſtempers. You lugged in, Page 1. *the Circumſtances of* Europe, to prove the Rectitude of your *Patron's* Conduct; Page 8, you double upon us, and take in the ungifted *Tories*; and here, Page 27. you hawl in the poor old *Cardinal* to ſtrike your Adverſaries dumb for ever. As your *Dexterity* is out of all Compaſs, 'tis

 dangerous

dangerous for ſo plain a Creature as I am to have any Thing to ſay to you: But then, if I ſhould drop you here, what will the World ſay? Why, they will ſay, what has been ſaid by all the Nation for ſome Months paſt, That all Conſiderations, but ſuch as regarded *Titles, Penſions* and *Preferments*, ſubſided in the Hearts of your Patrons.

But to be a little more ſerious; how could you, with ſo grave a Face, frighten your harmleſs Readers with a feeble doating old Man of Ninety? Do you, in your Conſcience, believe the *Cardinal* would be any greater Gainer if your Patrons had ſuffered the Three *Juſtices* and the *High Bailiff* to be puniſhed as they deſerved? Do you ſuppoſe the *Septennial* Law might not have been repealed without giving any Advantage to the ſuperanuated Prieſt? I agree he might be offended, if the *Woollen Manufacture* had been encouraged, or the Exportation of *Wool prevented*. Nor, probably, would his Mackarel Back be leſs up, if his old Crony, the late M——r, had been zealouſly purſued and puniſhed; but to ſay, that he did, or ought; or that any *foreign Conſideration* whatever ſhould influence the *Repreſentatives* of a free People; to urge, I ſay, any Excuſe of this Kind in Favour of Men for not doing their Duty, is the ſevereſt Charge could be brought againſt them.

Yo

You account for the Conduct of your *Patrons* much more naturally in the Words you put into the Mouths of the *new Patriots*, (Page 27) as you are pleaſed to call all thoſe that have not dropp'd their *Integrity* for *Titles*, *Secret Penſions* and *Places*. 'But, ſay the 'new *Patriots*, the Conduct of the Gentlemen 'I defend (the new M——ry) may be better 'accounted for another Way. Upon the 'Adjournment they had a Proſpect of be-'coming *Miniſters* themſelves; and this gave 'a new Turn to their Thoughts and Actions.' —Upon my Word, Sir, theſe *new Patriots*, as you call them, have no bad Hand at gueſſing: For, I think, it is now univerſally allowed, that the *Adjournment* gave a *new Turn* of Thought to your *Patrons*; and that the becoming *Miniſters* gave quite a *new Turn* to their Conduct.

But pray why do we find you diſtinguiſhing thoſe who have not ſurrendered their *Honeſty*, by the Appellation of *new Patriots*? If oppoſing bad *Miniſters* be Patriotiſm, they who oppoſed all *Miniſtries* ſince the *Acceſſion*, becauſe they all were *bad*, as has been already proved; they, I ſay, who are old in a virtuous Oppoſition, may, with more Propriety, be called *old*, than *new Patriots*: But ſome Diſtinction you judged neceſſary; and leſt the Publick ſhould beſtow the Epithet

new

new on your *Patrons*, to whom it properly belonged, you adopted it for your own, by apylying it to thoſe that have no Right to it, imagining we ſhould be excluded the making Uſe of it by your taking the firſt Poſſeſſion. Be it as you will, ſo that the *ſteady Friends* of the Nation have any Appellation to diſtinguiſh them from your venal, unſteady *Patrons*.

Your Deſcription of a good and bad *Miniſter*, Page 31, is ſo very juſt, that it deſerves to be quoted at large. 'I lay it down as a 'Thing certain, that a true Stateſman is 'one who places his Happineſs in promoting 'the King's Honour, and his Country's 'Good; and that a bad Stateſman, or an 'evil Miniſter, is one who prefers the Gra-'tification of his own Humour, whatever it 'is, whether the Affectation of Power, 'Wealth or Popularity, to the true Intereſt 'of his Maſter and his Fellow Subjects.' To this there can be no Exception; but your Application of the latter Part of it, in the next Page 32, is not altogether ſo unexceptionable. 'If therefore, you ſay, I prove 'that ſuch as have lately come into Power, 'have ſhewn a proper Reſpect to the Throne, 'much Tenderneſs for the People's true In-'tereſt, and very little Regard to what the 'World calls their own; then I ſhall have 'done all that I propoſed, and enough, I 'hope,

' hope, to put out of Countenance the new ' Oppoſition.' —— You will, indeed, have done Wonders, if you can perform your Promiſe.

There is no manner of Difficulty in proving that your *Patrons* have ſhewn a *proper Reſpect to the Throne.* The only diſputed Point on this Head is, whether they have not carried their *Reſpect* farther than was for the Benefit of the Governed. But the great Difficulty lies in proving your Patron's *Tenderneſs of the true Intereſt of the People, and Diſregard of their own.* If accepting of *Places,* and obeying with Implicitneſs ſince the Acceptance; and if burthening the People beyond their Strength, and obtaining nothing for them in Recompence, be Proofs of your *Patron's* Tenderneſs for the publick Intereſt, and Diſregard of their own, you have made good your Aſſertion. But if all the Actions of your *Demi Gods,* ſince they are veſted with Power, prove on the contrary, that the national Intereſt was their leaſt Care, and their *own* their greateſt, you have certainly failed in the main Support of your Argument.

After a great Expence of Ink, all that you ſay to prove the Rectitude of your *Patron's* Conduct is, Page 35, ' That Affairs at ' Home went as well as could be expected; ' the Parliament granted *liberal* Supplies,

' and

' and deſtin'd thoſe to proper Uſes; in con-
' ſequence of this, Affairs took a new Turn
' Abroad, *&c.*'——The People admit, becauſe they *feel*, the extenſive *Liberality* of your *Patrons* in granting *Supplies*; but they don't ſo readily admit, that other *Affairs* at Home went as well as they expected, becauſe all the Hardſhips they complained of ſtill continue: Nor can they ſee the leaſt Grounds for ſuppoſing that the *new Turn* of Affairs Abroad, is a Conſequence of your *Patron's* Wiſdom or Integrity. We all confeſs the late *Liberality* in granting Money; but till we ſee the Account of Diſburſements next Seſſions, we may be excuſed believing *that the Supplies were deſtin'd to proper Uſes.*

' *Integrity* and Application are the higheſt
' Qualifications, you tell us, Page 36, that
' can be expected in a Perſon who is intruſt-
' ed with the *publick Treaſure.*' This is admitted; but where is your Proof of the *Integrity* of the *Perſon* you endeavour to vindicate? Perhaps with you and your *Patrons*, the Word *Integrity* has another Meaning than with the reſt of your Fellow Subjects; but if you agree to the general Interpretation, you muſt firſt ſhew the Conformity of the new T——r's *Actions*, with his former *Profeſſions*, before we take your Word for his *Integrity*.

' Again

'Again, you ſay, the Flirts at a noble 'Lord who preſides at that Board (the T—y) 'amount to no more than this, that he was 'never violent on the Side of any Party, and 'conſequently can have but very few Ene-'mies, and no ſecret Views for himſelf, in-'conſiſtent with the Intereſt of his Country.' Upon this fine Portraiture of that *Lord*'s Character, I ſhall only ſay, that I don't know a fitter Perſon to be coupled with your *Patrons*, by reaſon of his wonderful *Docility* and Paſſiveneſs in all Companies and all Stations. For, as has been ſaid of him on another Occaſion, *He never was known in his Life publickly to oppoſe any one Scheme or Meaſure of the late Miniſter*, though the whole Nation, and even your *Patrons*, till very lately, thought him a very bad one.

You are, in no Part of your Work, ſo teſty as in Page 41 and 42, where you lug in his Majeſty's Speeches to Parliament, to prove, that what has been ſaid about the late Treaty at *Breſlau* was a *baſe Inſinuation*. On this Occaſion, really, Sir, you make a mighty Pother about nothing. You raiſe imaginary Windmils only for the Pleaſure of combating them. The *Mediation* was not diſputed. The Queen of *Hungary* always ſought it, becauſe, in Truth, ſhe had ſcarce another Choice to make; but the King of

Pruſſia may be ſuppoſed to have accepted of it from Neceſſity. The whole Point in Controverſy is, whether the Peace of *Breſlau* was owing to the Conduct and Influence of your *Patrons*, or to *Accidents*, in which we had no manner of Concern. The latter ſeems to me very evident, becauſe before theſe intervening *Accidents* happened, the King of *Pruſſia* received the Overtures of a *Mediation* with very great *Indifference*, not to ſay worſe. The Truth is, that Prince ſaw, too late I am afraid, into the Deſigns of *France*; but tho' he might have ſeen before the Battle of *Czaſlau*, that the *French* never intended his Aggrandizement; and that their Scheme was to look on whilſt the *Germans* ſhould cut one another down; yet, till Prince *Charles* of *Lorrain* th——ſh'd him into Reaſon, there was no perſuading him to quit an Alliance dangerous to himſelf and all the other Princes of the Empire.

But to humour you, if Conceſſion will bring you into Temper, we admit not only the great Efficacy of *Mediation*, but that his *Pruſſian* Majeſty was bullied or ſoothed into a *Neutrality*, by the Reſolution or Addreſs of your *Patrons*. But obſerve, that in granting thus much, I expect that no Part of the 500,000*l.* granted for the Support of the Queen of *Hungary*, will have been applied or *ſunk* in giving Weight to our Mediation.

Should

Should I find any dark Article to this Purpoſe in the Account of that great Sum, which is expected will be ſoon laid before the Houſe; or ſhould there be a Blank, as in the Items of *ſecret Service*; ſhould, I ſay, any thing myſterious appear, you muſt not take it amiſs that I recal all my *Conceſſions*, and place the Treaty of *Breſlau* to *Neceſſity* only.

Whilſt I am on this Subject, it may not be unſeaſonable to caution your *Patrons*, for another Reaſon, not to give the Publick any Room for ſuſpecting that any Part of the ſaid 500,000 *l.* has been employed at the Court of *Berlin*, as they will, if the Articles of the Account of that Money, ſhould not be clear and circumſtantial. Much has been ſaid about *Teſtamentary* Donations's being *uncomplied* with. To ſo intelligent a Perſon as your Works ſhew you to be, I need not be more explicit. I need not tell you what the Publick will be apt to ſay, ſhould it appear that any *large Sum* has been employed to back the magnified Mediation.

The next Page 43, ſhews how unhappy the greateſt Geniuſſes are in a Want of *Memory*. It was but 39 Pages before, that you aſſured us you would religiouſly avoid all *perſonal Panegyrick*, as well as *perſonal Reflection*; and yet here we find you loading one of your *Patrons* ſo unmercifully, that his

Duck Legs and *ſquat Back* bend under the Weight of your Adulation. You have beſtowed almoſt ſix Pages to prove that this great Man *does Honour to the Title he accepted*; and, as a Proof of it, you ſay, Page 44, 'That he preſerved, by his healing Advices, 'ſuch a Spirit of *Moderation* in a certain 'great Aſſembly, as enabled them to go 'thro' the publick Buſineſs in ſuch a Manner, '*as to receive the Thanks of their Sovereign, &c.*

We have had no Inſtances, in either the preſent or late Reign, of P——ts that have not conſtantly received Thanks from the T——ne at the Concluſion of each Seſſions; why then may not the preſent be complimented in as courtly a Stile as former P—ts, without aſcribing the Merit of the Royal Complaiſance to your Great Man, *that does Honour to the Title he accepted?* Surely Thanks was due to thoſe that had granted above *Sixty thouſand Land Forces, Forty thouſand Seamen, and near Seven Millions of Money*, without ſo much as requiring any *Favour* in Return? Now, if your *Patron* had done any thing the laſt Seſſions, to deſerve the *Thanks* of the *People* as well as the C—n, he had indeed *done Honour to the Title he accepted*; but as he has behaved, I very much queſtion the People's Concurrence in your Teſtimony of his *Honour*. And, if there be any Truth in that trite old Saying, *That the C—n may confer Titles,*

Titles, but it is the People that confer Honour, I fancy your Great Man may wear the *Firſt* to the Grave, without acquiring the *Latter*.

When your Hand was in, in diſplaying the Virtues of your *Patron*, it is pity you did not oblige us with the Preamble to his *Patent*; and ſure the Patent of ſo finiſh'd a *Patriot*, was not without a Preamble. Here we might ſee his Excellencies authenticated under the Broad Seal, which can cover no Impoſture or Untruth. I am thinking what could be the Merit of this *Great Man* with the Pr—ce. It could not poſſibly be his *Oppoſition* for *Sixteen* long Years to all the Meaſures of the C—t, becauſe that would be ſetting a dangerous Example. Sure it could not be for having *acted a double Part all the Time of his Oppoſition*, which indeed would be a Declaration of his *Addreſs*, but an undoubted Proof of his *Hippocriſy* and Villany. It is true you tell us, Page 46, *he deſerved a Title*; and add immediately, 'Could the Crown do 'leſs for one who had done ſo much for the 'Nation?'——How happy are we who live in an Age when the Crown conſiders *national Service!* All this, Sir, is elegantly enough expreſſed; it is ſprightly and bold too; but there is ſtill ſomething wanting, which a *Preamble* muſt neceſſarily have cleared up. We ſee that the Crown has conferred a *Title*, and you tell us, *leſs could not be done for one who*

who had done ſo much for the Nation. Now, this is what puzzles all your Readers. They want to know *thoſe Wonders your Great Man had done for the Nation.* Was it whilſt he *oppoſed* or *ſince*, that he did *ſo much* as to deſerve the Title, which the Crown could do no leſs than beſtow? On the Solution of this ſingle Queſtion depends the Character of your *Great Man*, on whom the *Pubick* do not think proper to confer *Honours*, tho' he be dubb'd with Titles. If you publiſh the *Preamble* to his Patent in your next *Gazetteer* perhaps more Indulgence may be ſhewn him; but until ſome better Proof than your Authority appears that he *does Honour to his Title*; or that the *Title* was conferred for *Services done to the Nation*, he muſt be contented with that jejune *Honour* which derives from *Title* alone.

But, ſay you, Page 47. 'We know that 'Scandal is a Tax every Man pays for being 'eminent. It is the Slave that runs behind 'the triumphant Chariot to allay the Hero's 'Joy, and put him in Mind of Mortality.'— Such was the conſtant Language of the late *Miniſter*'s ſtationed Scribes; ſuch, Sir, was yours, whilſt your preſent *Great Man* ſeemingly *oppoſed* that Blunderer and Plunderer of his Country.— 'But, you tell us in the ſame 'Page, we ſhould have a Care of puſhing 'this (our Scandal) too far for our own Sakes,

'if

' if we beſpatter Men in Proportion as they ' *ſerve us*, and pay ſuch Patriots as refuſe to ' pay themſelves with Injuries and Re- ' proaches, it may be doubtful, whether, in ' ſucceeding Times, this may not deter others ' from following their Examples, *&c.*

Good, ſmooth Declaimer, what does all this Fuſtian mean? ſhew me an Inſtance in this Land, which you tax ſo much with Ingratitude, where any Man, eminent for publick Virtue, has been generally ſatyrized and hated. A great and good Man may be envied by a few ambitious Men, but never can become an Object of publick Scorn and Contempt. Was the late *Miniſter*, that hated Object; is your preſent *Patron* become what the other was, 'tis becauſe one was a bad *Miniſter*, and the other a *Screener*, a *falſe Brother* and *pretended Patriot*—' If we beſpatter, ' you ſay, Men in Proportion as they *ſerve* ' *us*'—There are ſome Mortals ſo very incorrigible, that they can neither ſee an Error themſelves, nor rectify one when put in Mind of it. You could not ſee the Impropriety of talking, or rather dreaming, of your *Patron*'s Services before you proved that he had rendered the Publick any Service at all; nor did you benefit by what had been publiſhed, before you wrote, of his having *betrayed* both his Country and his Friends. If ever, hereafter, you ſhould be fee'd to attempt

tempt his Vindication, let me adviſe you to be ſilent as to any *Service* he has done to his Country. The leſs that is ſaid on a Subject that won't bear a Diſquiſition, the better, and, believe me, the *national Service* of your *titled Patron* is of that Species.

We find you, Page 48. wound up to a Kind of Extaſy, when you ſay, 'that we cannot 'but diſcover a very agreable Proſpect.'—— Here again you are at your old Work of exulting without aſſigning any Cauſe for Tranſport. Which Way ſhall a Man turn to meet the *agreable Proſpect*, which you ſay, *we cannot but diſcover?* If to the Continent, one ſees nothing but Confuſion, blundering Embarkations, expenſive Encampments, bullying, but inoffenſive Memorials, and an unmeaning, chargeable Hurry and Buſtle. If one turns his Reflection to home, how far is the *Proſpect from being agreable!* A ſtanding, uſeleſs Army, Taxes, an overgrown national Debt, Penal Laws in Plenty, Decay of Trade, Luxury, Infidelity, publick Perfidy and Hypocriſy; theſe are the Objects which preſent themſelves to View.——But, ſay you, after your Exultation for the *agreable Proſpect* before us, *the Greateſt, the Wiſeſt and the Worthieſt Perſons in the Three Kingdoms are now at the Head of Affairs.*

If

If this had been true, the *agreable Proſpect* you mention, would have been eaſily diſcover'd; and from its not being ſo, it happens that we can perceive no Traces of that *Agreableneſs* which appears ſo very plain to your penetrating Eye. To have our Affairs in the Hands of the Greateſt, Wiſeſt and Worthieſt of our Fellow-Subjects, would be a Proſpect which we have not been bleſs'd with of a great while: But tho' I ſhould be more civil than to diſpute what you ſo roundly aſſert, you may allow me to put you a few Queries, for my Information, concerning theſe ſuper-excellent Men.

There are two Sorts of *Men at the Head of our Affairs*, thoſe newly come in, and thoſe who had acted implicitly as directed by the late *Miniſter*; did you intend they ſhould be jumbled together; or, if you did not, to which of the *Sets* would you have us apply the Epithets, *Greateſt, Wiſeſt and Worthieſt?* If they be applicable only to one Party of our motely *Miniſtry*, than are not *our Affairs in the Hands of the Greateſt, Wiſeſt and Worthieſt*; but if to both indiſcriminately, you muſt admit either that the *new Comers* are gone off to the *old Set*, and act upon their Plan and Principles; or, that theſe *laſt* are come over to the *firſt*. In either of theſe Caſes, one Part of the *Miniſtry* muſt have quitted their own,

and taken up the Principles of the other, which neceſſarily proves, that they are *wrong* now, or have been ſo. If the *new Comers* were *right* in oppoſing the late *Miniſter*, the *old Set* were certainly *wrong* in concurring with him; therefore, the *latter*, before the Incorporation at leaſt, were neither the *Greateſt*, *Wiſeſt nor Worthieſt* of our Fellow-Subjects. If they are become ſo ſince, it muſt be for having taken up better Principles; but ſince we ſee the ſame *Meaſures* viſibly purſued now as before the late Junction, 'tis plain they have not ſwerved from their old Principles. If they have not, it muſt be admitted, that the *new Comers* are gone off to them; and that being the Caſe, I cannot comprehend how you could expect to gain Credit, when you aſſert, *that the Greateſt, Wiſeſt and Worthieſt are now at the Head of Affairs.*

'The preſent Parliament, you ſay, Page '49 and 50. has already done *much*; in the 'next Seſſions we may expect more; and, in 'Time, all.'—That the P——t has granted *much* Money, ſcreen'd *much*, and paid *much* Court where little was due, won't be deny'd; but that it has done *much* for the publick Benefit, won't, I fancy, be ſo readily allowed. That this ſame *much*-giving P——t will be more liberal in the *next Seſſions*, is not in the leaſt doubted; nor is it leſs ſo, that, in Time, it will do all; that is, give away our *All*, if

not

not check'd by a legal and unanimous *Oppoſition*. This is that which you ſo earneſtly endeavour to elude; and which I as earneſtly wiſh to ſee ſet on Foot. Your *Patrons* dread an *Oppoſition*, becauſe their preſent *Conduct* is inconſiſtent with their *Profeſſions* when they formerly *oppoſed*; but the People have no Reliance but on an *Oppoſition*, for defeating the Deſigns of Men that have deſerted the Principles upon which they oppoſed.

Notwithſtanding the Notoriety of their *Deſertion*, we find you, Page 50, throwing out the Gauntlet in their Defence as uſual. 'There is no Pretence for ſaying, that any 'of the Gentlemen who have been lately 'attacked as *Deſerters* of their former Prin-'ciples, have actually ſaid or done any 'thing which ſhews the leaſt Sign of their 'harbouring any ſuch Intention.' And a little after, 'If ſince they have acquired 'Power, they have done none but popular 'Things, why ſhould not we believe their 'Actions?'——We too credulouſly believed their *Profeſſions* formerly, by which they have deceived us; but we now believe their *Actions* only, which admit of no Deceit. From a Review of their *Actions*, ſince they have been in Power, we can obſerve no one *popular Thing* they have done, except an *Enquiry* ſet on Foot for puniſhing the late *Miniſter*, which we are now convinced was thrown out as a *Tub* to amuſe the Publick.

You are pleaſed to be very tart, Page 52, upon thoſe that diſapprove of your *Patron's* late Conduct for not proclaiming the *Grounds of their Diſcontent. They muſt know*, you ſay, *what they ſeek. If they would tell us what they would have, we ſhall know what to think.*—— Surprizing Stupidity, or Effrontery! Have not moſt of the Counties and Corporations in the united Kingdoms, by Inſtructions, informed their Repreſentatives what they wanted, or rather, what was wanted to ſecure their Freedom? Have not all the Woollen Manufacturers in the Kingdom petitioned to be relieved from the Miſeries that attend the Exportation of Wool to *France?*

But, Sir, ſince we find you as deaf to the Voice of the Publick as your *Patrons* have been the laſt Seſſions, I will take my Leave of you in ſetting before you ſome few of thoſe Things which the People *would have*, and which they expected your *Patrons* would have endeavoured to procure for them, that you and they may no longer plead Ignorance.

They would have effectual Laws in regard to *Places* and *Penſions*, and *Returning Officers*; they would have the *Septennial* Act repealed, and many other Acts which endanger their Liberties; ſuch as the *Waltham-Black* Act, the

the late *Smuggling* Act, the *Riot* Act; and a Thousand coercive Clauses in Acts relating to the *Excise*. They would have the *Army* reduced to the old Establishment, if there be no *French* War; and the *Militia* rendered useful by Law. They would have the late *Minister*, and all his Accomplices, fairly tried and punished, if convicted They would have a Committee for stating the Accompts of the Nation. They would have the Act of Settlement strictly observed with regard to *Foreign Concerns*. They would have *Pensions* and *Salaries* retrench'd, and all *Sine Cures* quite abolish'd. They would have those *Taxes* that immediately affect our Manufactures taken off, and replaced, if absolutely necessary, by a Tax on Luxury. They would have all Foreign Subsidies, and many other unnecessary expensive Articles retrenched. They would have the *Civil List* Revenue look'd into and regulated, so as there be no Superabundance for Ministers to employ in corrupting the Representatives of the People and their Constituents. They would have a certain standing C——t Maxim abrogated; that is, *that the Safety of the present Royal Family depends on the Non-payment of our national Debts*. They would have publick Oeconomy, and ministerial Honesty. In short, they would have what they have a Right to have; and what the *new Comers*, your present *Patrons*, had constantly professed they would

would obtain for them, if ever the *Oppoſition* to the late *Miniſter* ſucceeded.

Here, Sir, you have a curſory Catalogue of the People's *Wants*. They are, at leaſt many of them, of that Nature, that ſhould they continue much longer, there would neceſſarily be an End to *Britiſh Liberty*. The Miſchief is come too near home; the Evil is at Hand; the Diſtemper has taken ſuch Root as muſt endanger the noble Parts of the Conſtitution, if not ſuddenly removed. There is no Hopes of a Cure, but from an *Oppoſition* to the joint evil Deſigns of the *old miniſterial Sett*, and the *new Comers*, who have adopted their Principles. But to anſwer the End: To ſecure all that is dear to us; to tranſmit the *Freedom* acquired by the Blood and Wealth of our glorious Anceſtors to Poſterity, *the Oppoſition muſt be as general and unanimous as is conſiſtent with the Nature of our Conſtitution.*

I am, &c.

FINIS.